

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

July 11, 2006

5:45 PM

Chairman Duval called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Duval, Lopez, Gatsas, Garrity, Pinard

3. Ordinances:

“Amending Sections 33.024, 33.025 and 33.026 (Painter) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

“Amending 33.062, Part-Time Employees, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

Alderman Lopez moved for discussion. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Lopez asked if the Tax Collector, Mrs. Porter could come forward, they had received information at the 11th hour and asked if she could elaborate on the Part-Time Employees ordinance.

Joan Porter, Tax Collector, stated basically I was just looking for clarification on this and maybe a possible amendment to the ordinance, if you deem it necessary. Our situation was that we had a part time employee who became full time. Once she became full time we told that her hours as a part time employee gets thrown away and she starts over again working towards her six months or 1040 hours or probation period or whatever. My opinion was that this person was doing the exact same job, so when she started in November full time, she came in full time, she went from 20 hours to 40 hours. So I thought her hours from August to November should count toward her 1040 hours and that her merit should have been in April as opposed to May.

Alderman Lopez noted that Alderman Gatsas was chairman of Human Resources Committee may want to elaborate.

Alderman Gatsas asked Mrs. Porter, my understanding is that a part time employee once they become full time that for retirement benefits, health insurance, and everything else they are recognized as a date of hire from when their employment started.

Ms. Porter responded yes.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess my question and I don't think she is here, but I would assume that that would follow the same logical pursuit on vacation time and merits, that your date of hire is the same, if you put in the 1040 hours and as a part time employee it's taken you a year to get there then I would assume that would carry on to your full time status when you become a full time employee. Does that help you Alderman Lopez.

Alderman Lopez stated it made it more clear so we all understand. If I understand you correctly you are saying that the part time employees that receive benefits at this time, the only thing that they don't under the ordinance before us is that they would loose that part time and have to start all over again.

Ms. Porter stated right.

Alderman Lopez stated so we have to amend the ordinance if I understand you correctly to insure that the person that goes from part time doesn't loose those hours to accumulate the time as he or she moves into full time status.

Ms. Porter stated that would be my opinion. Obviously I don't want to hurt my cause but I can tell you that Ginny and I had this conversation and I can tell you that Ginny's thought on it is as a part time employee there is an ordinance for part time right now in effect there's no merit increase for part time employees because we haven't passed it and so there is an ordinance that does not include merit there is an ordinance for full time employees which does include six months and you get your merit. My thought process in requesting was that our intention that a part time person was going to work the same amount of time as a full time person to get that merit, so not sue the 1040 hours, my thought process was that in April that person would have worked more than six months but had then worked the equivalent of six months full time in hours, and to me that is why she should have qualified for an increase.

Alderman Gatsas stated Joan, I guess what are we talking about for dollars.

Ms. Porter responded for this particular person the difference was approximately \$100.

Alderman Gatsas stated if you followed suit with almost any employee there isn't going to be a big deviation from that \$100.

Ms. Porter responded it was minimal. And mostly I would like it clarified in the ordinance when we get it passed, how we are going to read, I think that one of the problems we have is that we are talking about hours in one ordinance and months in another ordinance, and if it were clarified at some point in time it would eliminate a lot of confusion.

Chairman Duval asked if she had held discussions with the HR Director on this specific issue.

Ms. Porter stated yes, that is what I was just explaining my discussion between Ginny and I and and trying to explain her thought process differing from mine was that you can't take what it says for a part time employee in the ordinance where there is no merit increase, you can't take what it says for a part time and apply it to a full time. So if we are going with 1040 hours for a part time employee you can't then apply that to a full time employee needing six months.

Alderman Gatsas stated I thought a full time was 2080.

Ms. Porter responded full time is six months for probationary merit, first time, 2080 is what a full time employee would work in a year.

Alderman Gatsas stated the other ordinance is not before us.

Ms. Porter responded correct, it is not.

Alderman Gatsas stated and what's that number.

Ms. Porter replied 33.047 is the probationary period which is the first six months of service.

Alderman Gatsas stated I guess we should change that and we need to talk to the HR Director. We should change that to 1040 so that they are both the same.

Ms. Porter responded I would think so.

Alderman Lopez stated even at six months though the department head has the authority to go to a year.

Ms. Porter responded yes, but that could extend it as well, we have a six month probation which is 1040 hours and you can extend that another 6 months so you could change that to another 1040 hours.

Alderman Lopez stated we can make an amendment here unless you want to go back to HR.

Alderman Gatsas stated I just want to make sure that when we change the six months to 1040 we are not doing something else to some other ordinances, such as retirement, or health insurance.

Ms. Porter replied I don't think it needs to be changed tonight, that's kind of like let's try to clean it up and make it all consistent type thing but the 1040 issue, we are passing an ordinance tonight 1040 hours, and I just wanted to clarify in that ordinance that if a part time employee goes into a full time position and is working the same type of work, same classification, that we should be able to keep their hours that they worked as a part time employee.

Alderman Gatsas stated but we can clean that up in 33.047, not deal with that tonight in amending this ordinance to make it that the employee gets the \$100, we can address it in 33.047.

Alderman Lopez moved that the ordinance relating to second 33.062 ought to pass and that the Human Resources Committee look at section 33.047. Alderman Gatsas duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted that the first ordinance listed with regard to Painter ought to pass.

TABLED ITEM

On motion of Alderman Gatsas, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to remove the following item from the table for discussion.

4. Ordinance:

“Amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding a new Chapter 54: Storm Water to Title V: Public Works.”
(Tabled 11/22/2005 pending further review by the Highway Department.)

Note: Attached is an amended version submitted by Highway, original submission is regular text, revisions crossed through and bolded; if the Committee so desires a motion will be in order to first amend the ordinance to that presented followed by a motion of ought to pass as amended.

Chairman Duval requested Deputy Public Works Director, Kevin Sheppard, to come forward and address the Committee advising of the Highway's present position on the item.

Mr. Sheppard stated we have taken awhile to get back to this committee it was quite a while ago that it actually went to a public hearing, there were some comments made at the public hearing since then we have made some changes to this as well as worked with the EPA on finalizing this ordinance, I'm not too sure if the ordinance, or the revised ordinance is part of the agenda or not

It was concluded that what was in the agenda is what the Highway Department had submitted to the City Clerk, it was the most recent and updated version of what the Highway Department has proposed.

Mr. Sheppard stated this is our recommendation after review of all public comments.

Chairman Duval noted that it had extensive review, had been around a long time so there was ample opportunity for input from all various people that have an interest in it.

Mr. Sheppard responded correct.

Alderman Garrity moved to amend the ordinance and that the ordinance ought to pass as amended. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

There being no further business on motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee